|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Student did not  submit the assignment. | |
| **Due Date: Monday,**  **Dec. 2nd, 2013** | **Student Name:**  **Course Name: Honors Geometry**  **Period:**  **Teacher Name: Ziegler** | |
| **Assignment Title:** | **You Be the Judge!** | |
| **Assignment Summary:** | We have been studying the components of a proof and the necessary steps to building a sound argument. This is an essential set of skills for argumentation and logical reasoning in other contexts besides geometry class. In this paper, you will analyze a set of “proofs” that might be put forth in a court of law.  **Paragraph 1: SUMMARIZE**   * Summarize the scenario according to what both parties agree on.   **Paragraph 2: POSTULATES**   * Identify geometric postulates used in Proofs (A-1) and (B-1) and whether or not they were used correctly.   **Paragraph 3: Argue FOR**   * Make a ruling and justify it by supporting the plaintiff’s proofs (A-1 and A-2) or the defendant’s proofs (B-1 and B-2). * Note: you MUST choose a side, you cannot grant both rulings.   **Paragraph 4: Argue AGAINST**   * Justify your ruling by arguing against the plaintiff’s proofs (A-1 and A-2) or against the defendant’s proofs (B-1 and B-2). * Note: you MUST choose the same ruling as in paragraph 3, only now you are doing it by arguing against the ruling you did not pick. | |
| **Role:** | You are the judge in this case. You are presenting your ruling to the court after careful deliberation and justify your decision based on analysis of the individual proofs. | |
| **Audience:** | Your audience is the members of the court, including the defendant and plaintiff, as well as Ms. Ziegler who is sitting in the benches in the courtroom. | |
| **Format:** | * **Typed, 1-inch margins, double spaced** * No excessive spacing of lines or margins * MLA format heading * Minimum length: **800 words**   (Inadequate length will result in a letter-grade drop – ***INCLUDE WORD COUNT!)*** | * Include your own creative title * Staple assignment sheet to front of final draft; staple rough draft to back of final draft * Indent the beginning of each paragraph |
| **Procedure:**  **Turnitin.com**  **Class ID:**  7308265  **Password:**  **3point14** | 1. Brainstorm 2. Outline 3. Write first draft 4. Peer edit 5. Make revisions based on editing 6. Proofread 7. Print final draft | |

Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exceeding** | **Meeting** | **Approaching** | **Baseline** | **Unacceptable** | **Points** |
| Content/CRS Expectations: | \_\_Identifies at least two postulates  \_\_Articulates whether or not used accurately  \_\_Offers a correction that would make the argument sound  20 | \_\_Identifies at least two postulates  \_\_Articulates whether or not used accurately  16 | \_\_Identifies at least one postulate  \_\_Incorrectly addresses accuracy of postulates  14 | \_\_Identifies at least one postulate  \_\_Does not address accuracy of postulates  12 | \_\_Does not identify postulates  \_\_Does not address accuracy of postulates  0 | \_\_\_\_ / 20 |
| **PLAINTIFF**  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  **And one of the following:**  \_\_Provides a correction to P’s offense that would make it logical **or**  \_\_Provides a correction to D’s defense that would make it logical  20 | All three of the following are argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  \_\_Recognize P’s offense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why D’s defense is illogical  16 | Missing one of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  \_\_Recognize P’s offense is illogical  \_\_Addresses that the D’s offense is illogical  14 | Missing two of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  \_\_Recognize P’s offense is illogical  \_\_Addresses that the D’s offense is illogical  12 | Missing all of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  \_\_Recognize P’s offense is illogical  \_\_Addresses that the D’s offense is illogical  0 | \_\_\_\_ / 20 |
| **DEFENDANT**  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  **And one of the following:**  \_\_Provides a correction to D’s defense that would make it logical **or**  \_\_Provides a correction to P’s offense that would make it logical  20 | All three of the following are argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  \_\_Recognize D’s defense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why P’s offense is illogical  16 | Missing one of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  \_\_Recognize D’s defense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why P’s offense is illogical  14 | Missing two of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  \_\_Recognize D’s defense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why P’s offense is illogical  12 | Missing all of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  \_\_Recognize D’s defense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why P’s offense is illogical  0 | \_\_\_\_ / 20 |
| Writing Expectations: | No spelling errors.  20 | Fewer than 2 spelling errors.  16 | Fewer than 6 spelling errors.  14 | Fewer than 8 spelling errors.  12 | Excessive amount of spelling errors.  0 | \_\_\_\_ / 20 |
| No subject-verb agreement errors.  20 | Fewer than 2 subject-verb agreement errors.  16 | Fewer than 6 subject-verb agreement errors.  14 | Fewer than 8 subject-verb agreement errors.  12 | Excessive amount of subject-verb agreement errors.  0 | \_\_\_\_ / 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total: \_\_\_\_\_ / 100 | |